



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,541	01/16/2002	Gavriel Meron	P-3228-US	1799
49443 7590 08/08/2007 PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER, LLP 1500 BROADWAY 12TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10036			EXAMINER BAPTISTE, KWAME H	
			ART UNIT 3737	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. As per interview with attorney Morey Wildes, the previous Detailed Action pertaining to application No. 10/046541, mailed on Monday, July 2nd, 2007, did not indicate it to be a final action. This action serves as a final action in response to applicant amendments, filed on 08/01/2006. Time is to be reset from the time of the previous action to the time this supplementary action is sent.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 51-71 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 51-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alfano et al (US 6,240,312 B1)(Alfano'312) in view of Iddan et al. (US Patent No. 5604531)(iddan'531) and further in view of Lemelson (US 5,993,378) (lemelson'378).

With regards to claims 51, 52, 54-56, 60, 61, 63-66, 68, 69, and 71 Alfano'312 disclose a method and apparatus where a capsule device introduced in vivo to navigate and diagnosis using optical imaging. The optical imaging is achieved via optical window, which includes illumination source 20 with optical light sensor (video camera) 20.

However, Alfano'312 does not disclose that each window or optical window covering at least an illumination source and an imager.

In the same field of endeavor, with regards to amended claims 51, 61, 63 and 68, Iddan'531 teaches an in vivo camera system (abstract), which both a in vivo micro camera (Fig.2 (24)) and a light source (Fig.2 (20)) transmit light and optical data though a single window (Fig. 2(22)), (Col. 3 Ln. 27-57).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the are to combine the disclosure of Alfano'312 and the teachings of Iddan'531 in order to provide a tubeless in vivo video camera system (Col.1 Ln. 34-54).

However, Alfano'312 in view of Iddan'531 not specifically disclose that the device includes two or more optical windows with each window having an illuminator and a detector, and each window facing in different directions.

In the same field of endeavor, it is known in the art as demonstrated by Lemelson'378 that an in-vivo device such as an optical catheter includes multiple optical capturing window and sensor array as shown in figures 11 and 12 (col. 11, lines 6-22). Although the array is directed at the same direction,

Lemelson'378 also indicates that the sensor arrangement may be positioned to face opposite direction as shown in figures 13 and 15 (col. 11, line 56 - col. 12, line 23). These sensors as disclosed to be a pressure transducers, however, Lemelson'378 teaches that the device's Sensor head arrangement was modify from the optical imaging head, therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Lemelson'378's multiple sensor window to Alfano'312's method and device to achieve the claimed invention.

Claims 53: The shape of the lens is not specified by Alfano'312 explicitly, however, as figure 2 shows that the lens is elliptical shape, thus, the outer shape of the optical window is a dome shape.

Claims 57-59, 62, and 70: Alfano'312 disclose a control unit within the capsule where the illumination or transmission of light is controlled for the image sensor. Therefore, the multiple sensors as disclosed in Lemelson'378 precludes that the multiple sensors detect multiple images.

Claim 67: Alfano'312 et al disclose in figure 2 where the images obtained from the device is transmitted remotely via radio channel.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Alfano'312 in view of Iddan'531 and the teachings of Lemelson'378 in order to sense multiple locations within a body, Lemelson'378 (Col.1 Ln.34-48).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwame H. Baptiste whose telephone number is 5712723076. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 5712724956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3737

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KHB


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700